• 12 The population of the genealogies used in the study consists of a total of 843 persons. Some of these people were born in the village of Hsiachichou and died there; others lived in the village only before or after their marriage; still others were born in the village but given away in adoption within a year or two of birth. The entire population with which we will be concerned does, however, have at least two traits in common. At one time or another in their lives all were members of a family living in Hsiachichou, and if they were not living there themselves in 1960 they did have at least one primary relative living in the village at the time, a father or mother, a son or daughter, a brother or sister, or a husband or wife. Although our genealogies refer to a number of people who have moved away from the village or who have died so long ago as to have no surviving primary relative, we have excluded these cases from our analysis, assuming that such information as we have about them is untrustworthy. For various reasons we were unable to obtain the precise date of birth of a number of people included in our genealogies. Nonetheless, we are able to estimate within a year or two the birthdates of the great majority of our population, since we usually know the ages of their children and their spouse. According to these estimates, 20 of these 843 people were born in the years 1871-1880, 22 in 1881-1890, 56 in 1891-1900, 79 in 1901-1910, 80 in 1911-1920, 134 in 1921-1930, 133 in 1931-1940, 104 in 1941-1950, and 215 in the decade 1951-1960. The time [101] period with which we will be concerned is therefore the ninety year period between 1870 and 1960, although it must be noted that by and

12 large the only decisions we will consider which took place before 1900
[101] will be those concerning adoption. Only a very small percentage of our total population reached marriageable age before the turn of the century.

[621] With the exception of the 20 members of 5 families who came to Taiwan from the mainland of China since World War II, the population of our genealogies includes all of the residents of Hsiachichou in 1960, a total of 72 families with a combined membership of 562 people. It is important to remember, however, that our genealogies do not include all of those people who lived in Hsiachichou during the period 1870-1960. In many cases families who once lived in the village have moved away, and in these cases we do not have the information necessary to include them in our records. Moreover, our information concerning those people we have included is not equally detailed. In some cases we may know a woman's age and sibling order, the form of her marriage, her father's sibling order, and so forth, while in another all we may know is that she was born in Hsiachichou and that she was given away in adoption as a child. The reader should therefore not be surprised to find that the samples which we use to test various hypotheses vary considerably in size. If all we need to know is whether or not a woman was given away in adoption, we can use a much larger sample than if her sibling order is important to the particular test, and if we also need to know her father's sibling order still further cases must be eliminated for lack of necessary information. Finally, the reader should be warned at the outset that the information in our genealogies is not entirely free of error. Since our records were

12 checked with various members of the village and then rechecked by a Chinese scholar who grew up in the community, we are confident that they are reasonably valid, but nonetheless some errors undoubtedly remain. The genealogical affairs of Hsiachichou are extraordinarily complex, so complex in fact that one of our informants suggested that we provide the village with a copy of our genealogies in order to help the natives of the place keep track of their own histories. When faced with conflicting reports from members of their own families, several village women admitted that they weren't really certain as to how many girls they had given in adoption. As one informant explained, "There were so many of them, and it was a long time ago. I know I I gave away the first three, and I may have given away the fourth, but then again she may be the one who died."

3:Wolf F-5 (1959-1961) 1968 AD5 Taiwan Hokkien AD5
Peihotien

FOREWORD

I shall not disguise my pleasure in being able, by writing a foreword to this admirable book, to contradict its author. Mrs. Wolf tells us in her preface that she is not an anthropologist and goes on to set out her three aims: to offer us a case study of a large Chinese family; to "provide another account of village life for those with a general interest in China"; and to "tell a good story." The charming simplicity and modesty of these brief statements may seduce the unwary reader into believing that the ease with which the subsequent narrative flows has been the happy result of literary skill coming upon a ready-made story. If anybody closes this book thinking that it is the Lims who have enlightened and entertained him, he will (I suspect) have fallen into a trap cunningly laid for him by the author. It is my job to put him on his guard and to force him to pay Mrs. Wolf the tribute that she seems unwilling to claim for herself.

This is a very cleverly constructed book in which the facts—so far from speaking for themselves—are made eloquent by the ideas which inspired their collection and arrangement. Of course, if Mrs. Wolf insists that she is not an anthropologist, then we must respect her disavowal. (It is perhaps a sign of the times. In the good old days people had less respect for professional degrees and licenses to practice.) I think it is all the more necessary for me to show how important anthropology has been both in her choice of problems and in the methods she has used to study them. I shall come back to the problems; let me say a word on methods.

Professor and Mrs. Wolf lived for two years in the household described in this book. In that period, while they were engaged in the investigation of many aspects of village life, they had the opportunity to study their immediate hosts and friends at close quarters. The word "study" may chill some readers, especially if they think of themselves as being in the position of the Lims and wonder how they would feel if their domestic life, quarrels and all, were under the cool gaze of foreign observers. But anthropology is a science in which the common humanity of the observer and the observed does not allow the one to make an object of the other. The investigator and the investigated are in a social relationship; and it follows that the facts about those under study must

3:Wolf F-5 (1959-1961) 1968 AD5 Taiwan Hokkien AD5
Peihotien

not only be checked and checked again for their accuracy (as in any kind of systematic inquiry), but must also be set out in such a manner as to be consistent with the duty of frankness that the student owes to his readers and the obligations of loyalty and friendship he bears to his subjects. Anthropology studies people intensively and decently, and I am sure that Mrs. Wolf has discharged her double duty in a way that will command the respect of the most experienced practitioners of the craft. The care and intensiveness of the observations are matched by the delicacy and sensitivity of their expression.

Sentimentality is the enemy of anthropology. To write with understanding of people whose institutions and beliefs are alien requires the anthropologist to make an effort to see them as they are and to portray them as he sees them. He must view them in the round and strive to penetrate the meaning of their behavior through the language they use. Because they are his fellow human beings the anthropologist has privileged access to them; but because they speak a different language and think with different symbols, he has to break the code of another culture. To make us the beneficiaries of his studies, he must translate the exotic idiom into a language we follow, but he must do his best to avoid distorting his findings in the process of translation. Mrs. Wolf's book is in elegant English, yet she is not acting as, so to say, a simultaneous translator, but rather as a creative interpreter. She has seized in this book on one segment of Chinese life, extracted its order and meaning, and made us the fortunate heirs of her understanding.

The Lims of this study are Taiwanese, and, except in her subtitle and preface, Mrs. Wolf talks about Taiwan, not China in general. I must respect her choice of terms, but I should not be doing my job competently if I failed to point out that we may sometimes be misled by her terminology. Two phases of modern history (accidents from our present sociological viewpoint) may tempt us to think of Taiwan as a separate "country." From 1895 to 1945 it was governed by the Japanese; since 1949 it has been cut off by civil war from the mainland of China. But it is part of China, and nobody familiar with Chinese patterns of social organization and behavior will have any difficulty in recognizing the Lims and their neighbors as good Chinese. True, their mother tongue is not Mandarin, but then they share this peculiarity with millions of Chinese on the mainland.

The point is worth stressing because there is a tendency to look upon studies made in Taiwan (and in the British colony of Hong Kong) as

121 All of this may falsely suggest that the community to be described in the following chapters is atypical for Taiwan. There were dozens of sites which satisfied all the specified requirements except the desire for a nearby sister village which would be identical in as many features as possible except the differences along a modern-to-traditional continuum. The presence of such a nearby village should have no effect on this current report which primarily focuses on the traditional village of the pair. Many other villages which would have served this last purpose equally well were located adjacent to even larger more sophisticated villages which contained factories and wine houses for example.

Research Methods

12 The standard methods of anthropological techniques were employed: participant-observation, mapping, census, interviews, etc. Although four key informants were developed and cultivated, at least four interviews were conducted with each adult resident of the village. Before departure, I knew and could recognize at a distance every adult and most of the children.

121 During the first nine months, we lived in the city
122 of Taipei and commuted to the village. We came at different times of the day and evening and remained for various periods of time. We often stayed overnight. I rented a room (occasionally sharing it with single young

121 in the dynamics of relationships between people. There is no necessary causal relationship between a structural approach and an emphasis on "ideal" culture rather than "actual" culture[10] with a concomitant dismissal of exceptions. Nevertheless, there tends to be a strong positive 114 relationship. According to Firth (1951:31), some anthro- 121 pologists have attempted "to see a social structure in sets of ideals and expectations alone." Firth goes on to distinguish between structure and organization, largely on the basis that social structure is timeless, persisting, and not concrete (1951:31-40).

Marion Levy provides one of the most convincing demonstrations of the anthropological emphasis on "ideal" rather than "actual" culture patterns (1965:1-63). In essence, Levy claims that the vast majority of the population in any society is likely to spend the bulk of their lives in elementary family units. Nevertheless, anthropological accounts are likely to focus on the cultural ideal, i.e., the unilineal extended or polygynous household, which constitutes a small minority and seemingly ignore the dominant (in terms of quantity) pattern.

12 I would suggest that the number of misinterpretations could be reduced by the following techniques: (1) enumeration of rates and cases, (2) a processural approach, (3) reduced emphasis on a single culture, and (4) comparative field studies by non-specialists. Each is explained and

[This should be footnote 9--Analyst]

12 discussed briefly in turn below.

The enumeration of examples and/or rates would increase confidence in the author's abstraction or summary. For example, assume an investigator reports that the oldest male in the senior generation is usually the head of the lineage. Doubt derives from the term usually. The information that there were but three exceptions out of 225 surveyed lineages would produce a picture quite different from a statement there were 100 exceptions. We would feel the latter, at least, required explanation and the author would also likely feel some constraint not to dismiss the exceptions. I am also assuming the original author is particularly sophisticated and thorough for he added a key word in the original statement, "usually." In fact, we often find absolute statements in the anthropological literature while there are few absolutes in real social life.

To illustrate this point consider one example from Fei Hsiao-tung whom I regard as a competent and honest anthropologist. In one ethnography he claims an expanded family is "the basic social group in the village" (1939:27), but after discussing its importance, he does provide the data that this basic group constitutes less than ten per cent of the village families (1939:28). It is only because of his thoroughness and enumeration of cases that we discover his apparent dismissal of 90% of the data in favor of the 10% which exemplifies the Great Tradition. It is

12. probably true that the extended family is the "ideal" social group in the village Fei studied. Fei's concrete data (1939:29) claiming 223 of 359 families contain a single married couple and 99 more do not include a married couple at all does not support his argument the extended family is "basic," at least on the "actual" level.

In the processural approach, extensive detailed case studies often provide enough data for a second investigator to make his own analysis rather than relying on the presented abstractions and more than one interpretation should aid in preventing errors. In each historical case of a restudy of the same community by different anthropologists, i.e., Lewis and Redfield or Goodenough and Fisher, contrary interpretations have been offered. Presentation of extensive detailed case studies which is characteristic of the processural approach permits a kind of restudy because it is one level closer to the actual social facts than is normally presented, i.e., observation rather than interpretation. In other words, there are social events which occur in the village; the anthropologist records these more or less completely in his field notes; and finally, he usually furnishes an interpretation in his presentation. In many accounts, we rely primarily on the interpretation of the anthropologist. In accounts featuring a processural approach, we often find the extended observational reports which furnishes, so to speak, an

• 12 examination of the author's field notes. These may still be incomplete, i.e., the reporter was a poor observer, or they may be unrepresentative, i.e., the author has not selected the proper cases, but nevertheless, they are less abstract and closer to reality than most former approaches.

As a secondary effect, the processural approach which includes "real" cases rather than mere abstract principles will aid in the misplaced concreteness on "ideal" culture.

The third and fourth suggestions are two sides of the same coin. A traditional belief in anthropology is that some research should be conducted in a society other than the society in which the investigator was originally enculturated. It appears that it may be possible for the anthropologist to become socialized in terms of the Great Tradition of the society under consideration to such an extent that he loses the objectivity which constituted the rational for the original insistence on cross-cultural research. Yet, history and the Great Tradition are sufficiently complex to require years to master reasonably and so important that they cannot be ignored. This apparent impasse may be overcome by (a) developing specialists in great civilizations but strongly encouraging them to conduct field research in a third culture to provide comparatively-derived objectivity, and (b) encouraging anthropologists to conduct field research in a Great Civilization in which they are non-specialized. In other words, the

12 anthropological study of China would likely be improved if the Sinologist were more often to punctuate his research in China with a venture into another area such as India or Africa and if a specialist in Indian or African cultures were more often to conduct a field study in China. Too narrow a specialization in one society is probably dysfunctional for anthropology as it is currently practiced.

Finally, as anthropology matures, it is becoming increasingly concerned with research methodology and techniques. It is possible to go too far down this road which may become a blind alley as perhaps has happened in mathematical sociology and experimental psychology. Yet, we have probably not gone far enough. I believe the above suggestions would eventuate in improvements but I am not unduly pessimistic with reference to the ability of anthropologists specializing in great civilizations to break through with new interpretations of cultural material using current techniques. For example, in spite of the Great Tradition and the concomitant problems such as those discussed above, anthropological sinologists have recently "discovered" and reported the true composition of the Chinese family (Hsu, 1943), the importance of affinal relatives (Gallin, 1960), the nature of lineage organizations in South Eastern China (Freedman, 1958; 1965), and the nature and importance of clans and lineages in the urban areas (Fried, 1968). The

12 nature of female roles in Chinese society presented in this dissertation should add to our understanding of Chinese society in spite of the contrast with "The Great Tradition."